



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

JGJR: 09-04

Paper No: \_\_\_\_

EVELYN D SHEN  
LEGAL DIVISION  
WARNER LAMBERT COMPANY  
201 TABOR ROAD  
MORRIS PLAINS NJ 07950

**COPY MAILED**

**SEP 16 2004**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of

Tecele

Application No. 09/889,106

Filing Date: 11 July 2001

Attorney Docket No. 18040 (PC17497A)

: DECISION ON PETITION

:

:

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed on 10 August, 2004, to revive the instant application 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) **GRANTED**.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the final Office action mailed on 20 October, 2003, with reply due, absent extension of time on or before 20 January, 2004;
- with a request and fee for a three- (3-) month extension of time, over a 20 April, 2004, certificate of mailing Petitioner filed on 22 April, 2004, an after-final amendment, which the Examiner found not to be proper in that it failed to place the application in condition

for allowance;<sup>1</sup>

- the instant application went abandoned after midnight 20 April, 2004;
- no Notice of Abandonment was mailed before the instant petition was filed;
- with the instant petition (and fee), Petitioner submitted the reply (a request for continued examination (RCE), fee, and a submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114), and made the statement of unintentional delay.

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>2</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>3</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>4</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The proper response to the final Office action (see: MPEP 711.03(c)) must be in the form of: (a) an amendment *prima facie* placing the application in condition for allowance; (b) a Notice of Appeal; or (c) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) (with fee and submission) under 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

<sup>2</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:  
**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**  
Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>4</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>6</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>7</sup>))

Allegations as to Unintentional Delay

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) requires a petition, fee, statement of unintentional delay, reply, and a terminal disclaimer and fee if appropriate.


As indicated above, Petitioner now has satisfied the regulatory requirements.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The instant application is released to Technology Center 1600 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>6</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

<sup>7</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.